Commissioner for Patents
February 7, 2008
Page 11 of 17

Serial No. 10/791,415 Confirm. No.: 5405
Art Unit: 2131 Examiner: Abrishamkar, Kaveh
IBM Docket: AUS920020015US1(4278)

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1-2, 6-14, 17-23, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102, and claims 3-5, 15-16, and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103. Applicant, respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant requests interview

Applicant respectfully requests an interview if it would expedite disposition of the application. The undersigned attorney would welcome and encourage a telephone conference with Examiner at (512) 391-4913.

Objections to the specification

Applicant appreciates acceptance by the examiner of the IDS form submitted for the application.

Objections to the specification

Applicant requests entry of amendments above to the first paragraph of the specification. These amendments address the objections to the specification in the Office action.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-2, 6-14, 17-23, and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Blaker et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0081600A1 (hereinafter referred to as "Blaker"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections are with the following remarks.

Commissioner for Patents
February 7, 2008
Page 12 of 17

Serial No. 10/791,415 Confirm. No.: 5405
Art Unit: 2131 Examiner: Abrishamkar, Kaveh
IBM Docket: AUS920020015US1(4278)

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single reference.[1] Furthermore, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.[2]

With regards to claim 1, the Office action fails to establish a prima facie case of anticipation for independent claim 1 because Blaker fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, "each and every element as set forth in the claim". In particular, Blaker fails to describe a plurality of processors coupled to the memory ... to perform... security operations ..., wherein the security operations comprise execution of at least one security protocol; and a plurality of security coprocessors coupled to the memory... to assist the respective processor in performing security operations on the portion of the data, wherein assistance for the respective processor comprises execution of at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol.

Blaker describes a plurality of processors coupled in parallel between a DEMUX and a MUX.[3] The DEMUX evaluates related packets and assigns each of them to one of the processors in an order and the MUX reassembles the packets.[4] The rejection of claim 1 equates the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker to both the data coprocessor and the plurality of security coprocessors. However, neither the DEMUX nor MUX perform at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol.

In fact, the rejection of claim 1 fails to interpret claim 1 in the context of the whole application. For example, the rejection of claim 1 assumes that it would be obvious to add logic to obscure/decipher, determine the integrity, and establish a security association in the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker, as is described in claim 3, which fundamentally changes the operation of Blaker. Thus, Blaker fails to describe the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicant traverses that the rejection, requests that the rejection be withdrawn, and requests that claim 1 be allowed.

---

[1] *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).
[2] *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).
[3] Blaker FIG. 1.
[4] Blaker par. 37, lines 1-20, par. 42, lines 1-7, and par. 45, lines 5-7.

Commissioner for Patents
February 7, 2008
Page 13 of 17

Serial No. 10/791,415   Confirm. No.: 5405
Art Unit: 2131 Examiner: Abrishamkar, Kaveh
IBM Docket: AUS920020015US1(4278)

Claims dependent upon claim 1 incorporate the limitations of claim 1 and thus Applicant traverses rejections of claims 1-11 and requests that claims 1-11 be allowed.

With regards to claim 13, the Office action fails to establish a prima facie case of anticipation for independent claim 13 because Blaker fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, "each and every element as set forth in the claim". In particular, Blaker fails to describe performing security operations ... in parallel using a plurality of processors, wherein the performing comprises executing at least one security protocol and using a plurality of security coprocessors ..., wherein the using comprises tasking the security processors with execution of at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol.

Blaker describes a plurality of processors coupled in parallel between a DEMUX and a MUX.[5] The DEMUX evaluates related packets and assigns each of them to one of the processors in an order and the MUX reassembles the packets.[6] The rejection of claim 13 equates the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker to both the data coprocessor and the plurality of security coprocessors. However, neither the DEMUX nor MUX perform at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol.

In fact, the rejection of claim 13 fails to interpret claim 13 in the context of the whole application. For example, the rejection of claim 13 assumes that it would be obvious for the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker to obscure/decipher, determine the integrity, and establish a security association, as is described in claim 15, which fundamentally changes the operation of Blaker. Thus, Blaker fails to describe the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicant traverses that the rejection, requests that the rejection be withdrawn, and requests that claim 13 be allowed.

Claims dependent upon claim 13 incorporate the limitations of claim 13 and thus Applicant traverses rejections of claims 14-21 and requests that claims 14-21 be allowed.

With regards to claim 22, the Office action fails to establish a prima facie case of anticipation for independent claim 22 because Blaker fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, "each and every element as set forth in the claim". In particular, Blaker fails

---

[5] Blaker FIG. 1.

[6] Blaker par. 37, lines 1-20, par. 42, lines 1-7, and par. 45, lines 5-7.

Commissioner for Patents
February 7, 2008
Page 14 of 17

Serial No. 10/791,415 Confirm. No.: 5405
Art Unit: 2131 Examiner: Abrishamkar, Kaveh
IBM Docket: AUS920020015US1(4278)

to describe performing security operations ... in parallel using a plurality of processors, wherein the performing comprises executing at least one security protocol and using a plurality of security coprocessors ..., wherein the using comprises tasking the security processors with execution of at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol.

Blaker describes a plurality of processors coupled in parallel between a DEMUX and a MUX.[7] The DEMUX evaluates related packets and assigns each of them to one of the processors in an order and the MUX reassembles the packets.[8] The rejection of claim 22 equates the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker to both the data coprocessor and the plurality of security coprocessors. However, neither the DEMUX nor MUX perform at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol.

In fact, the rejection of claim 22 fails to interpret claim 22 in the context of the whole application. For example, the rejection of claim 22 assumes that it would be obvious for the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker to obscure/decipher, determine the integrity, and establish a security association, as is described in claim 24, which fundamentally changes the operation of Blaker. Thus, Blaker fails to describe the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Applicant traverses that the rejection, requests that the rejection be withdrawn, and requests that claim 22 be allowed.

Claims dependent upon claim 22 incorporate the limitations of claim 22 and thus Applicant traverses rejections of claims 22-29 and requests that claims 22-29 be allowed.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

The Office action rejected claims 3-5, 15-16, and 24-25 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blaker in view of Grohoski et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0225885 A1 (hereinafter referred to as "Grohoski"). Applicant respectfully suggests that the rejections are traversed with the following remarks:

---

[7] Blaker FIG. 1.
[8] Blaker par. 37, lines 1-20, par. 42, lines 1-7, and par. 45, lines 5-7.

Commissioner for Patents
February 7, 2008
Page 15 of 17

Serial No. 10/791,415 Confirm. No.: 5405
Art Unit: 2131 Examiner: Abrishamkar, Kaveh
IBM Docket: AUS920020015US1(4278)

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the modification or combination must teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations.[9]

The combination of Blaker and Grohoski fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 3, 15, and 24 because the combination fails to teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations and changes a principal of operation of Blaker. In particular, the combination fails to teach or suggest the use of a plurality of security coprocessors.

The combination fails to teach or suggest the use of a security coprocessor for execution of at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol performed by the plurality of processors. To support the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 22, the Office action points to the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker. As discussed above, however, the DEMUX and MUX are not capable of obscuring/deciphering, determining the integrity, and establishing a security association with the data. In the rejections of claims 3, 15, 24, the Office action indicates that it would be obvious to add to the DEMUX and/or MUX logic to obscure/decipher, determine the integrity, and establish a security association. Adding such capabilities to a DEMUX and/or MUX fundamentally changes the principal of operation of Blaker. Thus, the combination fails to teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations and changes a principal of operation of Blaker. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections of claims dependent upon claims 3, 15, and 24, requests the rejections be withdrawn and requests that all claims be allowed.

The combination of Blaker and Grohoski fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 4, 16, and 25 because the combination fails to teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. In particular, the combination fails to teach or suggest the use of a plurality of security coprocessors to execute at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol performed by the plurality of processors.

The combination fails to teach or suggest the use of a security coprocessor for execution of at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol performed by the plurality of processors. To support the rejection of claims 1, 13, and 22, the Office action

---

[9] In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 985, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974).

Commissioner for Patents
February 7, 2008
Page 16 of 17

Serial No. 10/791,415 Confirm. No.: 5405
Art Unit: 2131 Examiner: Abrishamkar, Kaveh
IBM Docket: AUS920020015US1(4278)

points to the DEMUX and MUX of Blaker. As discussed above, however, the DEMUX and MUX are not capable of execution of at least one algorithm of the at least one security protocol. Thus, the combination fails to teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations and changes a principal of operation of Blaker. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections of claims dependent upon claims 4, 16, and 25, requests the rejections be withdrawn and requests that all claims be allowed.

Commissioner for Patents
February 7, 2008
Page 17 of 17

Serial No. 10/791,415 Confirm. No.: 5405
Art Unit: 2131 Examiner: Abrishamkar, Kaveh
IBM Docket: AUS920020015US1(4278)

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully traverses the cited references with regards to the claim rejections under 35 USC §§ 102 and 103. Accordingly, Applicant believes that this response constitutes a complete response to each of the issues raised in the Office action. In light of the accompanying remarks, Applicant believes that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn, pending claims be allowed, and application advance toward issuance.

A request for extension as well as authorization to charge the corresponding fee to a credit card accompany this action. No other fee is believed due with this paper. However, if any fee is determined to be required, the Office is authorized to charge Deposit Account 50-0563 for any such required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

February 8, 2008

/Jeffrey S Schubert/

_____

_____

Date

Jeffrey S. Schubert, reg. no. 43098, cust. no.: 45670
Schubert Osterrieder & Nickelson PLLC
One Congress Pl, 111 Congress Ave, 4th fl, ste 403
Austin, Texas 78701
512.692.7297 (tel)   512.301.7301 (fax)
Jeff.Schubert@sonlaw.com, http://www.sonlaw.com
Attorney for Applicant(s)